SUPREME COURT MINUTES FRIDAY, MARCH 18, 2005 SAN FRANCISCO, CALIFORNIA

S131016

E034760 Fourth Appellate District,

Division Two

PEOPLE v. SMITH

Time extended to grant or deny review

to April 27, 2005.

S131060

H025863 Sixth Appellate District

PEOPLE v. HUGHES

Time extended to grant or deny review

to April 28, 2005

S074804

PEOPLE v. HARTSCH (CISCO)

Extension of time granted

to May 20, 2005 to file appellant's opening brief. After that date, only four further extensions totaling about 195 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon Deputy State Public Defender William Hassler's representation that he anticipates filing that brief by 11/30/2005.

S125755

RAMIREZ (RICHARD) ON H.C.

Extension of time granted

to April 21, 2005 to file the reply to the informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus. After that date, only six further extensions totaling about 190 additional days will be granted. Extension is granted based upon counsel Geraldine S. Russell's representation that she anticipates filing that document by 10/30/2005.

S131902

B172238 Second Appellate District, Division Five STARVING STUDENTS v. DIVISION OF LABOR

Extension of time granted

Respondent's time to serve and file the answer to the petition for review is extended to and including April 1, 2005.

S130542

A105042 First Appellate District,

Division One

PEOPLE v. OLIVER

Counsel appointment order filed

William Amos Lawrence appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S130725

B171070 Second Appellate District,

Division Four

PEOPLE v. JONES

Counsel appointment order filed

Susan Keiser appointed to represent appellant on the appeal now pending in this court.

S115824

MILLER (DONALD) ON H.C.

Order filed

Respondent's motion to file supplemental informal response to the petition for writ of habeas corpus is granted. Any reply is to be served and filed on or before April 18, 2005.

S132182

A097783 First Appellate District, Division Three SMITH v. S.C. (PEOPLE) Transferred to CA 1

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, First Appellate District, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition shall be denied.

S132242

CAZELLY v. S.C. (PEOPLE) Transferred to CA 4/3

The above-entitled matter is transferred to the Court of Appeal, Fourth Appellate District, Division Three, for consideration in light of *Hagan v. Superior Court* (1962) 57 Cal.2d 767. In the event the Court of Appeal determines that this petition is substantially identical to a prior petition, the repetitious petition shall be denied.

S108587

IN THE MATTER OF THE SUSPENSION OF ATTORNEYS PURSUANT TO RULE 962, CALIFORNIA RULES OF COURT Orders filed (2)

- (1) Having been provided proof of compliance pursuant to Family Code 17520, the suspension of **STEVEN H. HERTZ** pursuant to our order filed on February 1, 2005, is hereby terminated. This order is final forthwith.
- (2) Having been provided proof of compliance pursuant to Family Code 17520, the suspension of **CHARLES H. SCHEETZ** pursuant to our order filed on July 25, 2002, is hereby terminated.

 This order is final forthwith.

S130414

S108587

REITZ ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed

> It is ordered that PATRICE A. REITZ, State Bar No. 82606, be suspended from the practice of law for one year, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that she be placed on probation for two years on condition that she be actually suspended for 60 days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed November 8, 2004. It is further ordered that she take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar and one-third of said costs must be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2006, 2007 and 2008. (Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6086.10.)

S130417

MCCANN ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed

It is ordered that ROBERT MCCANN, State Bar No. 170286, be suspended from the practice of law for two years, that execution of suspension be stayed, and that he be placed on probation for two years on condition that he be actually suspended for sixty days. Respondent is also ordered to comply with the other conditions of probation recommended by the Hearing Department of the State Bar Court in its order approving stipulation filed October 28. 2004. It is further ordered that he take and pass the Multistate Professional Responsibility Examination within one year after the effective date of this order. (See Segretti v. State Bar (1976) 15 Cal.3d 878, 891, fn. 8.) Costs are awarded to the State Bar in accordance with Business & Professions Code section 6086.10 and one-half of said costs must be added to and become part of the membership fees for the years 2006, and 2007.

S130418

O'DONNELL ON DISCIPLINE Recommended discipline imposed: disbarred

It is hereby ordered that **JOHN WILLIAM O'DONNELL**, **State Bar No. 52673**, be disbarred from the practice of law and that his name be stricken from the roll of attorneys.

Respondent is also ordered to comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court, and to perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is effective.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar.

*(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)

S132085

BLANCHFILL ON RESIGNATION Resignation accepted with disc. proceeding pending

The voluntary resignation of **Stephen Ira Blanchfill**, **State Bar No. 132884**, as a member of the State Bar of California is accepted

without prejudice to further proceedings in any disciplinary proceeding pending against respondent should he hereafter seek reinstatement. It is ordered that he comply with rule 955 of the California Rules of Court and that he perform the acts specified in subdivisions (a) and (c) of that rule within 30 and 40 days, respectively, after the date this order is filed.* Costs are awarded to the State Bar. *(See Bus. & Prof. Code, § 6126, subd. (c).)